

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

DARRON R. PERKINS, )  
Plaintiff, )  
V. ) Civil No. **05-754-MJR-CJP**  
ST. CLAIR COUNTY JAIL, et al., )  
Defendants. )

**ORDER**

**PROUD, Magistrate Judge:**

Before the Court is plaintiff's motion to compel the defendants to comply with the Trial Practice Order (**Doc. 47**), which required the parties to comply with Local Rule 26.1. (**Doc. 61**). Plaintiff contends the defendants have not provided him with a myriad of specific information. In response, defendants note the distinction between that which was required to be disclosed in accordance with Local Rule 26.1, and information that may be requested via interrogatory and request for production. (**Docs. 62 and 63**).

One need only review the information plaintiff asserts was improperly withheld or not disclosed to see that plaintiff has confused the relatively minimal information that must be disclosed under Local Rule 26.1 and the more specific information he seeks. The Court's order and Local Rule 26.1 simply do not require the automatic disclosure of the information plaintiff now seeks. Whether plaintiff has submitted specific discovery requests that have not been complied with remains to be seen, as plaintiff has not submitted copies of any such discovery requests to the Court.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion to compel (**Doc. 61**) is **DENIED**.

**DATED:** April 27, 2009

s/ Clifford J. Proud  
**CLIFFORD J. PROUD**  
**U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE**